

### SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS BY COUNTY FOR FY2012

Local Funding (County)	EQIP Contracts	EQIP Funds Obligated	WHIP Contracts	WHIP Funds Obligated	AMA Contracts	AMA Funds Obligated	CSP Contracts	CSP Funds Obligated
Churchill	23	\$1,440,931	1	\$69,714	0	\$0	7	\$25,662
Clark	1	\$4,437	1	\$14,967	0	\$0	1	\$2,047
Douglas	5	\$300,764	0	\$0	1	\$4,436	0	\$0
Elko	22	\$920,239	1	\$70,838	6	\$20,405	6	\$234,896
Esmeralda	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Eureka	5	\$357,967	0	\$0	0	\$0	1	\$2,967
Humboldt	12	\$826,378	3	\$69,109	0	\$0	1	\$28,978
Lander	9	\$915,838	1	\$30,163	0	\$0	1	\$6,130
Lincoln	19	\$873,299	2	\$32,046	2	\$13,185	0	\$0
Lyon	11	\$1,024,391	1	\$31,367	0	\$0	4	\$51,146
Mineral	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Nye	8	\$680,883	1	\$21,099	1	\$6,712	0	\$0
Pershing	11	\$885,052	2	\$46,054	0	0/ \$0.00	3	\$49,971
Washoe	22	\$1,806,877	1	\$64,537	4	\$17,988	0	\$0
White Pine	8	\$572,608	3	\$21,222	0	\$0	2	\$9,989

### SUMMARY OF HU\* PARTICIPANTS IN PROGRAMS BY COUNTY FOR FY2012

Local Funding (County)	EQIP Contracts	EQIP Funds Obligated	WHIP Contracts	WHIP Funds Obligated	AMA Contracts	AMA Funds Obligated	CSP Contracts	CSP Funds Obligated
Churchill	14	\$511,140	0	\$0	0	\$0	7	\$25,662
Clark	0	\$0	1	\$14,967	0	\$0	1	\$2,047
Douglas	1	\$41,624	0	\$0	1	\$4,436	0	\$0
Elko	10	\$584,703	0	\$0	4	\$16,498	0	\$0
Esmeralda	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Eureka	1	\$69,606	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Humboldt	2	\$83,709	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Lander	1	\$141,569	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Lincoln	7	\$292,162	0	\$0	2	\$13,185	0	\$0
Lyon	3	\$170,258	0	\$0	0	\$0	1	\$1,000
Mineral	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Nye	4	\$124,663	0	\$0	1	\$6,712	0	\$0
Pershing	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	1	\$2,902
Washoe	10	\$571,875	0	\$0	4	\$17,988	0	\$0
White Pine	3	\$371,939	2	\$20,618	0	\$0	0	\$0

\*HU – Historically Underserved = Beginning Farmer/Rancher; Limited Resource Farmer/Rancher; Socially Disadvantaged

### SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS BY COUNTY FOR FY2011

Local Funding (County)	EQIP Contracts	EQIP Funds Obligated	WHIP Contracts	WHIP Funds Obligated	AMA Contracts	AMA Funds Obligated	CSP Contracts	CSP Funds Obligated
Churchill	7	\$294,290	0	\$0	2	\$10,375	5	\$43,146
Clark	3	\$328,416	0	\$0	3	\$17,265	0	\$0
Douglas	8	\$312,130	2	\$90,353	2	\$12,188	0	\$0
Elko	7	\$139,598	1	\$17,516	5	\$5,121	1	\$80,000
Esmeralda	3	\$243,351	0	\$0	0	\$0	3	\$55,892
Eureka	3	\$172,547	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Humboldt	10	\$990,103	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Lander	8	\$762,726	0	\$0	0	\$0	1	\$39,436
Lincoln	12	\$1,128,717	2	\$279,531	2	\$15,044	0	\$0
Lyon	12	\$1,470,921	0	\$0	0	\$0	1	\$17,176
Mineral	1	\$119,486	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Nye	3	\$237,834	1	\$43,420	0	\$0	0	\$0
Pershing	9	\$720,640	0	\$0	1	\$3,812	0	\$0
Washoe	3	\$258,992	1	\$8,164	1	\$4,486	0	\$0
White Pine	11	\$484,204	2	\$174,357	0	\$0	1	\$77,236

### SUMMARY OF HU\* PARTICIPANTS IN PROGRAMS BY COUNTY FOR FY2011

Local Funding (County)	EQIP Contracts	EQIP Funds Obligated	WHIP Contracts	WHIP Funds Obligated	AMA Contracts	AMA Funds Obligated	CSP Contracts	CSP Funds Obligated
Churchill	2	\$84,346	0	\$0	2	\$10,375	1	\$9,358
Clark	2	\$320,401	0	\$0	2	\$12,187	0	\$0
Douglas	2	\$86,229	0	\$0	2	\$12,188	0	\$0
Elko	3	\$50,346	0	\$0	5	\$5,121	0	\$0
Esmeralda	2	\$226,844	0	\$0	0	\$0	1	\$21,112
Eureka	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Humboldt	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Lander	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Lincoln	5	\$506,172	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Lyon	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Mineral	1	\$119,486	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Nye	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Pershing	4	\$413,674	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Washoe	2	\$222,776	0	\$0	1	\$4,486	0	\$0
White Pine	1	\$20,150	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0

\*HU – Historically Underserved = Beginning Farmer/Rancher; Limited Resource Farmer/Rancher; Socially Disadvantaged